arXiv:1611.05325v2 [gr-qc] 29 Nov 2016

TRANSITION PROBABILITY SPACES IN LOOP QUANTUM GRAVITY

XIAO-KAN GUO

ABSTRACT. We study the (generalized) transition probability spaces, in the sense of Mielnik and Cantoni, for spacetime quantum states in loop quantum gravity. First, we show that loop quantum gravity admits the structures of transition probability spaces. This is achieved by first checking such structures in covariant quantum mechanics, and then passing to spin foam models via the general boundary formulation. The transition probability space thus defined gives a simple way to reconstruct the Hilbert space of the canonical theory and the relevant quantum logical structure. Second, we show that the transition probability space and in particular the spin foam model are 2-categories. Then we discuss how to realize property transitions and causality in this categorical context in connection with presheaves on quantaloids and respectively causal categories. We conclude that transition probability spaces provide us with an alternative framework to understand various foundational questions of loop quantum gravity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Right after the advent of quantum mechanics(QM), the logical structures of QM was studied by Birkhoff and von Neumann[1]. This lattice-theory-based quantum logic not only provides us with a deep foundation of the Hilbert space formalism of QM[2], but also leads us to a more natural mathematical structure for QM (namely, the type II_1 factor von Neumann algebra[3]). This already indicates the possibility of describing QM by theories different from or even beyond the theory of Hilbert spaces. Since, for both phenomenological and operational reasons, the most relevant quantities in QM are transition probabilities rather than the logical structures, a possible alternative description of QM can be based on the space of (generalized) transition probabilities[4, 5, 6, 7]. The advantage of using transition probability spaces is that the state space of QM are characterized directly by transition probabilities between quantum states, which are undefinable in the original quantum logic (see Ref. [8] for some examples) unless additional structures (such as continuous geometry[9]) are introduced into the framework. Note that such a change of description does not mean that we have abandoned the ontologically logical structures and chosen an epistemologically phenomenological approach. In fact, the logical and probabilistic aspects of QM can be included in a unified framework[10], and at a deeper level, they can be simultaneously and coherently defined on a lattice[11]. Therefore, it remains fundamental but at the same time has an operational meaning in real experiments.

In this paper we will study the theoretical structures of loop quantum gravity(LQG) with the help of transition probability spaces. Methodologically, since LQG is *within* the quantum formalism, these structures of transition probability spces are sure to be correct in LQG, however, they are not easy to be identified. What we hope is that this alternative description of the quantum formalism will

Date: November 30, 2016.

clarify the structures of LQG. On the other hand, if a theory of quantum gravity is in general *beyond* the current formalism of quantum theory, we think that the transition probability space will be a possible approach to that more general theory.

A direct motivation of this work comes from the spin foam approach to LQG[12], where the crucial quantity is the spin foam amplitude, the transition amplitude between spin network states. The second motivation comes from the observation that the rigorous kinematic Hilbert space of canonical loop quantum gravity constructed from the holonomy-flux algebra and the quantum spin dynamics thereon[13] allow further mathematical constructions of a quantum logic or a transition amplitude space. It is therefore hoped that these two approaches can be related or unified in a transition probability (amplitude) space. Besides, it is well-known that observables are difficult to define, even in classical general relativity, and the situation is not getting better in quantum gravity. Now in the approach via transition probability spaces, the fundamental concepts are shifted from the observables to the states and the transition probabilities between them, which is obviously more suitable for analyzing quantum gravity.

The first goal of this paper is to describe spin foam models by transition probabilty spaces. To this end, we will take the following three steps of descriptions:

(1) *General covariant QM*. This is because the transition probability spaces in the literature are defined only for nonrelativistic QM. In relativistic gravitational systems, general covariance is required. We thus consider the general covariant QM proposed by Reisenberger&Rovelli[14] as an example, and construct corresponding transition probability space. We also consider the timeless path integral[15] derived from the general covariant QM where the transition amplitudes have been constructed.
(2) *General boundary formulation*. The general boundary formulation of quantum theories[16] provides a bridge connecting QM and quantum gravity. We consider the probabilities in this formulation and show that they define a transition probability space.
(3) *Spin foam models*. As is shown in Ref. [17], the EPRL(/FK) spin foam model can be cast into the general boundary formulation, which manifests a description via transition probability spaces.

That all these theories admit the descriptions via tansition probability spaces is not surprising, but the supporting arguments are far from obvious. A direct consequence of this description is the ability to reconstruct the canonical formalism from the transition amplitudes, which not only corroborates but simplifies earlier constructions. Then the logic of quantum gravity can be readily constructed from the transition probability space. These are done in Sec. 3.

The second purpose of this paper is to search for possible categorical characterizations of transition probability spaces in LQG. We show that, following the initiative of Baez[18], the transition probability space and hence the spin foam model, are 2-categories. In particular, similar to but different from those in Ref. [19], the 2-cells of the 2-category of spin foams are identified to be the branched covers of spin netwoks from which the spin foams emanate. Based on these 2-categories, we show that the property transitions in a quantum logic can be described by state tranitions in the classical Boolean algebra obtained through localizing onto the presheaves. Furthermore, we explore the possibility that causality in spin foam models is encoded in the causal category of spin foams. Some of the results are

not new, but we attempt to put them into a coherent picture. These are collected in Sec. 4.

In the next section, we briefly review the definitions and basic properties of transition probability spaces, their generalizations, and transition amplitude spaces. A new view of these structures from the operational quantum theory is also given. In addition to the materials reviewed here, basic knowledge of LQG at the level of the book [13] and categories at the level of the book [20] is presumed throughout this paper.

2. Review of Transition Probability Spaces

We first recall some basic definitions and known results concerning transition probability spaces. The details can be found, for instance, in Refs. [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In Sec. 2.4 we show that the transition probabilties just introduced are consistent with operational probability theory framework for QM.

2.1. **Transition probability spaces.**

Let S be a nonempty set of pure quantum states. In the language of Hilbert spaces, a pure state corresponds to an one-dimensional projector x with a one-dimensional range spanned by unit vectors ψ such that $x\varphi = \psi(\psi,\varphi)$. The transition probability between x and y is $p(x,y) = \mathrm{tr}(xy)$. For any states, not necessarily pure, described by density matrices ρ,σ, the transition probability between them is the fidelity[21]

$$P(\rho,\sigma) = \left[\mathrm{tr}\sqrt{\rho^{1/2}\sigma\rho^{1/2}}\right]^2.$$

By observing the properties of these transition probabilities, we can define the transition probability space.

Definition 2.1. A transition probability space (S,p) is a set of states S with a real-valued transition probability $p(a,b), a,b \in S$ such that

(1) $0 \leqslant p(a,b) \leqslant 1$ and $p(a,b) = 1 \Leftrightarrow a = b$;
(2) $p(a,b) = p(b,a)$;
(3) Two states $a,b \in S$ are orthogonal if $p(a,b) = 0$. A maximal subset $R \subset S$ where each distinct pair of states are orthogonal is a basis of S. Then

$$\sum_{r\in R} p(a,r) = 1, \quad \forall R \subset S,\ \forall a \in S.$$

From condition (3) it is easy to see that any two bases of S have the same cardinality which is just the dimension of S. The following basic properties resemble those of a vector space. A subspace (S',p') of (S,p) is such that $S' \subset S$ and $p' = p\restriction_{S'}$. Two transition probability spaces (S_1,p_1) and (S_2,p_2) are isomorphic if there is an isomorphism $x \to x'$ of S_1 to S_2 such that $p_1(x,y) = p_2(x',y')$. (S_1,p_1) can be embedded into (S_2,p_2) iff the latter contains a subspace isomorphic to (S_1,p_1). The orthocomplement $A^\perp$ of a subspace $A \triangleq (S_1,p_1)$ of a transition probability space (S_2,p_2) is the maximal subspace of (S_2,p_2) whose states are orthogonal to A and $A \cap A^\perp = \emptyset$. A subspace A is orthoclosed if $A = A^{\perp\perp}$. One can easily see that an orthoclosed subspace A is the orthocomplement of any basis of $A^\perp$. Moreover, the orthoclosed subspaces form an atomic orthomodular poset[5].

With these operations, one can indeed reconstruct the quantum logic from a transition probability space (cf. Ref. [22, 23][1]). Furthermore, as for vector spaces, one can construct disjoint unions (or direct sums) of (S_1, p_1) and (S_2, p_2) by setting $p(a,b) = 0$ if $a \in S_1, b \in S_2$ or $a \in S_2, b \in S_1$ and $p(a,b) = p_i(a,b), i = 1,2$ if a, b belong to the same S_i. Then a transition probability space is irreducible if it is not the disjoint union of two nonempty orthogonal subspaces. Every transition probability space is the disjoint union of irreducible subspaces (or superselection sectors).

In a transition probability space, one can also define a topology by introducing the metric

$$d(a,b) = \sup_{c \in S} \big| p(a,c) - p(b,c) \big|.$$

Then $p(a,b)$ is jointly continuous in this metric topology. For arbitrary mixed states this definition of distance still holds, for which cf. Ref.[25], with a change from state spaces to transition probability spaces.

An example of the transition probability space is the Hilbertian space $(S_{\mathscr{H}}, p)$ where $S_{\mathscr{H}}$ is the set of all the rays Ψ in a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ and the transition probability between two rays $\Psi_i = e^{i\alpha_i}\psi_i, i = 1,2$ is

$$p(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) = |\langle \psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle|^2.$$

The metric can be witten in terms of the one-dimensional projectors as

$$d(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) \equiv d(x_1, x_2) = \sup_y \mathrm{tr}[(x_1 - x_2)y] = ||x_1 - x_2||_{\max} = \sqrt{1 - |\langle \psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle|^2}$$

where in the last step we have used the relations $(x-y)^3 = [1 - p(x,y)](x-y)$ and $1 - p(x,y) \leqslant d(x,y)$. A subspace of $S_{\mathscr{H}}$ corresponds to a closed vector subspace of $\mathscr{H}$, which, however, does not hold in a general transition probability space. Now an important question is whether there is a representation theorem like Piron's that the transition probability space can be represented on a Hilbert space. The answer is affirmative[26] and the proof uses generalizations of superposition principles in quantum logics to transition probability spaces.

2.2. **Generalized transition probability spaces.** More generally, for a set X with measure $\mu(X) = n$, the subsets $s \subset X$ with measure $\mu(s) = 1$ form a state space with the transition probability $p(s_1, s_2) = \mu(s_1 \cap s_2)$. Following Mackey[27], one can choose the measure to be the probability measure $d\alpha_A$ on a Borel set E of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\int_E d\alpha_A = p(A, \alpha, E)$ is the probability (amplitude) of the measurement of the observable A on the state α with an outcome taking value in E.[2] For any pair of states α, β under a measurement of A, one has the transition measure (the Kakutani distance)

$$\int_E d\sqrt{\alpha_A \beta_A} = \int_E \sqrt{\frac{d\alpha_A}{d\sigma}\frac{\beta_A}{d\sigma}} d\sigma$$

where $d\alpha/d\sigma, d\beta/d\sigma$ are the Radon-Nikodym derivatives with respect to the finite measure σ. This transition probability is generalized by Cantoni[6].

[1] Note that in Ref. [23] the symmetry condition (2) is not required. However, if one wants to represent the quantum logic on a Hilbert space, the symmetry becomes essential to prove Piron's representation theorem. Cf. Ref. [22] and also Ref. [24].

[2] In the present case we use Greek letters $\alpha, \beta \ldots$ to denote the quantum states, so as to emphasize that their measures are $d\alpha_A, d\beta_A \ldots$.

Definition 2.2. For any pair of states α,β under a measurement of A, let

$$T_A(\alpha,\beta)=\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}} d\sqrt{\alpha_A,\beta_A}\Big]^2.$$

A generalized transition probablity from α to β is

$$T(\alpha,\beta)=\inf_A T_A(\alpha,\beta).$$

One can check that the $T(\alpha,\beta)$ satisfy the condtions (1) and (2) in definition 2.1. As to the condition (3), we already have $T(\alpha,\beta)=\sup\big|(\alpha,\beta)^2\big|\equiv\mathscr{P}(\alpha,\beta)$[28]. Then by the concavity of $\mathscr{P}$[21], we have

$$\sum_{\beta\in R}T(\alpha,\beta)=N\sum_{\beta\in R}\frac{1}{N}\mathscr{P}(\alpha,\beta)\leqslant N\mathscr{P}(\alpha,\frac{1}{N}\sum_{\beta\in R}\beta)=1,$$

where we have assumed, without loss of generality, that each state β has equal probability $1/N$. The last equality comes from the fact that R covers S by definition and hence we have chosen $\sum_{\beta\in R}\beta=S$ by Zorn's lemma. On the other hand, since $0\leqslant T(\alpha,\beta)\leqslant 1$ and $T(\alpha,\beta)=1$ when $\alpha=\beta$, consider the special case where there is a $\beta\in R$ such that $\alpha=\beta$, then obviously

$$\sum_{\beta\in R}T(\alpha,\beta)=1+\sum_{\beta\in R,\beta\neq\alpha}T(\alpha,\beta)\geqslant 1.$$

Therefore, we must have $\sum_{\beta\in R}T(\alpha,\beta)=1$ and the $T(\alpha,\beta)$ together with the state space form a *generalized* transition probability space.

Furthermore, the generalized transition probability $T(\alpha,\beta)$ can be used to define a metric between pure states (the Bures distance)

$$d(\alpha,\beta)=\sqrt{2(1-\sqrt{T(\alpha,\beta)})}.$$

A space of generalized transition probabilities can be set in motion. Indeed, the action on a state α of an element m in a mobility semigroup $\mathscr{M}$[7] maps the state to a fictitious state $m\alpha$ at later time. The generalized transition probability $T(\alpha,\beta)$ is nondecreasing under m,

$$T(\alpha,\beta)\leqslant T(m\alpha,m\beta),\quad\text{ and hence } d(\alpha,\beta)\geqslant d(m\alpha,n\beta).$$

The equality holds when m represents a unitary evolution, which becomes a compatibility requirement when one wants to equip a transition probability space with a Poisson structure[29]. In particular, given a Poisson manifold P and a space of quantum pure states S, one can obtain the classical limit of QM by searching for a *classical germ*[30], i.e. a family of injections $q_\hbar:P\to S$ such that

$$\lim_{\hbar\to 0}p(q_\hbar(\chi),q_\hbar(\zeta))=\delta_{\chi,\zeta}$$

where χ,ζ correspond to the classical (Liouville, if P is symplectic) measures on P.

An alternative form of $T(\alpha,\beta)$ will be useful. In the quantum logic L, an observable A_i corresponds to a proposition a_i and hence the state α_{A_i} is mapped to the probability measure α_{a_i} on $[0,1]\subset\mathbb{R}$. A sequence of a_i in L is a maximal orthogonal sequence if they are mutually orthogonal and $\cup_i a_i=1$. Since $\mathbb{R}$ can be partitioned by Borel sets E_i as $\mathbb{R}=\cup_i E_i$, we can therefore write $T(\alpha,\beta)$ as

$$T(\alpha,\beta)=\Big[\inf_{\{a_i\}}\sum_i\sqrt{\alpha_{a_i}\beta_{a_i}}\Big]^2.$$

In fact, one can show that[31]

$$T(\alpha,\beta)=\left[\inf_R \sum_{\gamma\in R}\sqrt{p(\alpha,\gamma)p(\beta,\gamma)}\right]^2.$$

where the p are the transition probabilties defined in definition 2.1 and the infimum is taken over all basis R of S.

2.3. **Transition amplitude spaces.** The generalized transition probability is not the end of the story. In QM the more computable and more intuitive quantities are the transition amplitudes, the generating functionals for path integrals. Hence, in addition to the transition probability spaces, one can also define the transition ampiltude spaces[32]. In later sections of this paper, the transition amplitude is the starting point of most discussions.

Consider the map $A: S\times S\to\mathbb{C}$, where S is still the space of pure states, such that for two $a,b\in S, a\neq b$ to be orthogonal it only requires that $A(a,b)=0$.

Definition 2.3. An $M\subset S$ is an A-set if the following conditions are satisfied,

$$\sum_{c\in M}|A(a,c)A(c,b)|<\infty,\quad A(a,b)=\sum_{c\in M}A(a,c)A(c,b),\quad \forall a,b\in S.$$

Let $\mathscr{N}_A$ be the class of A-sets. The map A given above is a transition amplitude if (i) $\mathscr{N}_A\neq 0$; (ii) $A(a,a)=1,\forall a\in S$. The space (S,A) is then a transition amplitude space.

A transition amplitude space is strong if $A(a,b)=1$ implies $a=b$, and total if $\mathscr{N}_A=R$, a basis of S. One can readily check that for a total transition amplitude space (S,A), $|A(a,b)|^2$ is a transition probability and $(S,|A(a,b)|^2)$ forms a transition probability space.

As an example of transition amplitude spaces, consider again the Hilbertian space $(S_{\mathscr{H}},p)$ with the transition amplitude defined by $A(a,b)=\langle\psi(a),\psi(b)\rangle=\sqrt{p(a,b)}$. Amplitude functions $A_a: S\to\mathbb{C}$ such that $A_a(b)=A(a,b)$ correspond to wave functions of QM which form a complex Hilbert space. In fact, the transition amplitude spaces can also be related to the algebraic approach to QM. Given a transition amplitude space (S,A), a general map $B: S\times S\to\mathbb{C}$ is called a form. A sequence $(\mathfrak{a}_i,a_i)\in\mathbb{C}\times S$ is a null sequence $n_0(A)$ if

$$\sum_i|\mathfrak{a}_iA(a_i,b)|<\infty,\quad \sum_i\mathfrak{a}_iA(a_i,b)=0,\quad \forall b\in S.$$

A form B is an A-form if

$$\sum_i\mathfrak{a}_iB(a_i,b)=\sum_i\mathfrak{a}_iB(a,b_i)=0,\quad \forall b\in S,\ (\mathfrak{a}_i,a_i)\in n_0(A).$$

A form B is bounded if there exists a $\mathfrak{b}>0$ such that,

$$\sum_{c\in M}\left|\sum_i\mathfrak{a}_iB(c_i,c)\right|^2\leqslant\mathfrak{b}^2\sum_i|\mathfrak{a}_i|^2,\quad \forall M\in\mathscr{N}_A,\ (\mathfrak{a}_i,c_i)\in\mathbb{C}\times M.$$

In the set $\mathscr{B}(S,A)$ of bounded A-forms, which is obviously a complex linear space under pointwise additions and scalar multiplications, one can define the involution $B^*(a,b)$ by complex conjugation, the norm $||B||$ by the infimum of the bound $\mathfrak{b}$, and the product by

$$BC(a,b)=\sum_{c\in M}B(c,b)C(a,c),\quad \forall B,C\in\mathscr{B}(S,A),\ M\in\mathscr{N}_A.$$

Then $\mathscr{B}(S,A)$ is a unital C^*-algebra with identity A. There exists an isometric C^*-isomorphism from $\mathscr{B}(S,A)$ to that of bounded linear operators on the Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ such that $B(a,b) = \langle \hat{B}\psi(a), \psi(b)\rangle$, where $\mathscr{H}$ is the GNS Hilbert space with its states represented by the positive linear functional $B_A : \mathscr{B}(S,A) \to \mathbb{R}$, or the real[3] amplitude functions.

2.4. **A view from operational quantum theory.** We have seen that the symmetry condition of the transition probability can be relaxed if one only wants to recover the formal Born's rule of QM. However, on the one hand, the Hilbert space representation theorem requires the symmetry[22, 24], and on the other hand, due to the timeless feature of quantum gravity the time reversal symmetry should be preserved at the level of transition probabilities. In fact, recent results[33, 34] have shown that such a time reversal symmetry is permitted in a generalized formulation of operational probability theories. We seek the relation between these formulations, which will be useful in the next section.

The operational formulation of QM given in Refs. [33, 34] consists of the following ingredients:

(1) *Operations or vertices*. Each vertex is associated with an operation defined as a set of events $\{M_i^{\mathscr{I}\mathscr{O}}\}$ where the superscripts $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{O}$ represent the boundary systems within the Hilbert space $\prod_{a\in\mathscr{I}}\mathscr{H}_a \otimes \prod_{b\in\mathscr{O}}\mathscr{H}_b$,[4] the subscript denotes the possible values of outcomes, and the M are positive semidefinite operators acting on the boundary Hilbert space.
(2) *Wires*. Two vertices are connected by a wire representing the entangled states W between the boundary systems. The composition of two operators is obtained by tracing over the entangled states between these two operations.
(3) *Networks*. The vertices connected by wires form a network. The joint probability for this network is the probability conditioned on all the "input" states
$$P = \frac{\mathrm{tr}\left[W(\otimes M_i)\right]}{\mathrm{tr}\left[W(\otimes \sum_i M_i)\right]}$$
where the indices for boundary systems are omitted for simplicity.

Now for the formulation in terms of transition probabilty spaces, (i) the operators in operations can be chosen as the projectors $P_{\mathscr{S}}$ to the subspaces $\mathscr{S}$ of the total Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ so that at each vertex there is a class of states (with different phases); (ii) the wires are defined by tracing over the intermediate states W, which can be encoded into the summation condition of Definition 2.3; (iii) the probabilty now becomes the conditional probability of finding states in the subspace $\mathscr{S}$ provided the subspace $\mathscr{S}'$,
$$P = \frac{\mathrm{tr}\left[WP_{\mathscr{S}}\right]}{\mathrm{tr}\left[WP_{\mathscr{S}'}\right]}.$$
If $\mathscr{S} \subset \mathscr{S}'$, one can readily check that this probability is the transition probability from states in $\mathscr{S}'$ to those in $\mathscr{S}$. Thus, the transition probability spaces are consistent with the operational formulation of QM of Refs. [33, 34]. This form of transition probability also shows that the expectation value of an operator in the

[3]The reality is due to the A-form condition.

[4]In the time asymmetric case, $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{O}$ are respectively interpreted as *input* and *output* states.

Hilbert space language is now a transition probablity with the final state (space) being projected out by this operator.

Besides, it has been pointed out by Coecke[35] that such an operational theory equipped with compositions of operations by connecting the wires and with tensor products between operations/wires can be described by a monoidal category. For transition probability spaces, the (tensor) product $\otimes$ is definable for all the state spaces via the dual description of the disjoint union $\sqcup$ (or coproduct), and hence two wires can be braided making it a braided monoidal category. If two state spaces can be related by a transition, they constitute a pair of boundary systems as above. Then the symmetric condition for transition probabilities indicates the existence of transposing of a pair of boundary systems, which is an Hermitian conjugate † in the tensor product Hilbert space. Hence one obtains a dagger (or rigid) monoidal category.

3. Transition Probability Spaces for Loop Quantum Gravity

The transition probability spaces reviewed in the last section are designed for QM only. In order to study quantum gravity one has to generalize them in two directions: the first is to include general covariance; the second is to incorperate the formalism of quantum field theories(QFT). We first consider the general covariant QM in both canonical and covariant formulations. Then we proceed to the general boundary formulation which is not only suitable for describing QFT but also for QM and quantum gravity. The EPRL spin foam model can be put into such a general boundary formulation that the structure of transition probability space will become manifest. In the rest two subsections, the canonical LQG Hilbert space is reconstructed from spin foam amplitudes and the possibility to derive quantum logics from the transition probability spaces of spin foams is pointed out.

3.1. General covariant quantum theory I: spacetime states.

In the general covariant quantum theory proposed by Reisenberger&Rovelli[14], the basic concepts are the spacetime-smeared representation of quantum states and the propagators (or transition amplitudes) between these spacetime states. Here the spacetime smearing means that both spatial and temporal measurements in realistic experiments are impossible to be infinitely sharp and need to be smeared. Here by general covariance we mean that the spacetime is not fixed and can change with the spacetime smeared states through the smearing functions.

Consider a time-dependent quantum state $|X,T\rangle$ in some Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$, where X stands for spatial coordinates and T for the time coordinate. Then any such state can be transformed to another through the propagators W as

$$|X,T\rangle = \int dX'dT' \langle X',T'|X,T\rangle |X',T'\rangle \equiv \int dX'dT' W(X',T';X,T)|X',T'\rangle .$$

In general, the following function is also a wavefunction of QM,

$$\Psi_f(X,T) \equiv \langle X,T|\Psi_f\rangle = \int dX'dT' W(X,T;X',T') f(X',T')$$

where $f(X,T)$ is a smooth function depending on spacetime. This is because by Riesz's representation theorem, there always exists a $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathscr{H}$ such that $f(X,T) = \langle X,T|\Phi\rangle$. Therefore, we can define

Definition 3.1 (Reisenberger&Rovelli[14])**.** Given a spacetime dependent smearing function $f(X,T)$ and a $|X,T\rangle \in \mathscr{H}$, the spacetime-smeared representation of $|X,T\rangle$ is

$$|f\rangle \equiv \int dXdT\, f(X,T)\,|X,T\rangle\,.$$

In particular, for a small (compared to the scale in question) spacetime region $\mathscr{R}$, the spacetime-smeared representation of a quantum state supported on $\mathscr{R}$ (or simply a spacetime state on $\mathscr{R}$) is

$$|\mathscr{R}\rangle \equiv C_{\mathscr{R}} \int_{\mathscr{R}} dXdT\,|X,T\rangle\,, \quad C_{\mathscr{R}} = \Big(\int_{\mathscr{R}} dXdT \int_{\mathscr{R}} dX'dT' W(X,T;X',T')\Big)^{-1/2}.$$

The Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_f$ of the spacetime-smeared states $|f\rangle$ has a simple inner product

$$\langle f|f'\rangle = \int dXdT \int dX'dT'\, f^*(X,T)W(X,T;X'T')f(X',T').$$

On the other hand, the spacetime states $|\mathscr{R}\rangle = C_{\mathscr{R}}\,|f_{\mathscr{R}}\rangle$, where $f_{\mathscr{R}}$ is a characteristic function of the region $\mathscr{R}$, will give two inner products. The first one is the inner product between a spacetime state and a particle state $\langle\mathscr{R}|\Psi\rangle$, then $|\langle\mathscr{R}|\Psi\rangle|^2$ is the probability of finding the particle state $|\Psi\rangle$ in the region $\mathscr{R}$. The second is the transition amplitude between spacetime states

$$\langle\mathscr{R}|\mathscr{R}'\rangle = C_{\mathscr{R}}C_{\mathscr{R}'}\int_{\mathscr{R}} dx \int_{\mathscr{R}'} dyW(x;y), \quad x\equiv(X,T),\, y\equiv(X',T').$$

That this is indeed a transition amplitude can be easily checked as in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Given two spacetime states $|\mathscr{R}\rangle, |\mathscr{R}'\rangle$ on the regions $\mathscr{R},\mathscr{R}'$ respectively, the inner product $\langle\mathscr{R}|\mathscr{R}'\rangle$ defines a transition amplitude $A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'})$.*

Proof. Denote $\langle\mathscr{R}|\mathscr{R}'\rangle \triangleq A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'})$. Firstly, it is obvious from the definitions that $A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}}) = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}) = C_{\mathscr{R}}C_{\mathscr{R}'}\int_{\mathscr{R}} dx \int_{\mathscr{R}'} dyW(x;y) = \\
&= \int_{\mathscr{R}''} dzC_{\mathscr{R}}C_{\mathscr{R}'}\int_{\mathscr{R}} dx \int_{\mathscr{R}'} dyW(x;z)W(z;y) = \\
&= \int_{\mathscr{R}''} dzC_{\mathscr{R}}C_{\mathscr{R}'}\int_{\mathscr{R}} dx \int_{\mathscr{R}'} dyW(x;z)C_{\mathscr{R}''}C_{\mathscr{R}''}\int_{\mathscr{R}''} dz \int_{\mathscr{R}''} dzW(z;z)W(z;y) = \\
&= \int_{\mathscr{R}''} dz\Big(C_{\mathscr{R}}C_{\mathscr{R}''}\int_{\mathscr{R}} dx \int_{\mathscr{R}''} dzW(x;z)\Big)\Big(C_{\mathscr{R}''}C_{\mathscr{R}'}\int_{\mathscr{R}''} dz \int_{\mathscr{R}'} dyW(z;y)\Big) = \\
&= \int_{\mathscr{R}''} dzA(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}''})A(f_{\mathscr{R}''}, f_{\mathscr{R}'})
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we have used the property of propagators, in the third line inserted $A(f_{\mathscr{R}''}, f_{\mathscr{R}''}) = 1$, and in the fourth line $W(z;z) = 1$ by definition. Secondly, since $0 \leqslant W(x,y) \leqslant 1$ by definition, we always have $0 \leqslant A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}) \leqslant 1$, and hence

$$\int_{\mathscr{R}''} dz|A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}''})A(f_{\mathscr{R}''}, f_{\mathscr{R}'})| = \int_{\mathscr{R}''} dzA(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}''})A(f_{\mathscr{R}''}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}) = A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}) \leqslant 1.$$

Therefore, the class $\mathscr{N}_A$ of A-sets $\{|\mathscr{R}''\rangle\}$ is nonempty. □

Denote by $\mathscr{H}_{\mathscr{R}}$ the space of spacetime states, then $(\mathscr{H}_{\mathscr{R}}, A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}))$ is a transition amplitude space and the following is immediate.

Theorem 3.3. $(\mathscr{H}_{\mathscr{R}}, |A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'})|^2)$ *is a transition probability space.*

Proof. First we need to show that $(\mathscr{H}_{\mathscr{R}}, A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}))$ is total. This can be achieved, as in the prescription for the time arrival problem given in Ref. [14], by choosing a sequence of spactime regions $\mathscr{R}_n = [X_n, X_n + n\varepsilon] \times [T_n, T_n + n\xi]$ with finite spacetime resolution ε, ξ which are obviously mutually orthogonal. By Zorn's lemma we have $\mathscr{N}_A = R$. Now conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 2.1 are clearly satisfied.[5] Finally, since $(\mathscr{H}_{\mathscr{R}}, A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}))$ is total,

$$\sum_{\mathscr{R}' \in R} |A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'})|^2 = \sum_{\mathscr{R}' \in \mathscr{N}_A} |A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'})|^2 = \sum_{\mathscr{R}' \in \mathscr{N}_A} A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}) A(f_{\mathscr{R}'}, f_{\mathscr{R}}) = 1$$

where we have used the fact that $A(f_{\mathscr{R}}, f_{\mathscr{R}'}) = A^*(f_{\mathscr{R}'}, f_{\mathscr{R}})$ which again comes from the property of W. Hence the condition (3) is also satisfied. □

For spacetime states $|\mathscr{R}\rangle$ the smearing function is just the characteristic function $\chi_{\mathscr{R}}$ of region $\mathscr{R}$. In analogy to the definition of generalized transition probability, one can understand the probability $|\langle \mathscr{R}|\Psi\rangle|^2$ defined by the former type of inner product as follows. The inner product $\langle \mathscr{R}|\Psi\rangle$ can be decomposed as

$$\langle \mathscr{R}|\Psi\rangle = \int_{\mathscr{R}} dX dT C_{\mathscr{R}} \chi_{\mathscr{R}} \langle X, T|\Psi\rangle = \Big(\int_{\mathscr{R}} C_{\mathscr{R}}\Big)\Big(\chi_{\mathscr{R}} dX dT \Psi(X,T)\Big) \equiv \int_{C_{\mathscr{R}}} d\mathscr{R}_\Psi,$$

which represents the probability (amplitude) of finding the particle wavefunction Ψ in the spacetime state localized on the small region $\mathscr{R}$ taking value in interval normalized by $C_{\mathscr{R}}$. Therefore, a generalized transition probability for spacetime states can be analogously defined by taking the infimum of the transition measures over the particle states Ψ.[6]

One might face the complication that in addition to the transitions between spactime states, there will be transitions between particle states localized either in the same region or in distinct regions. However, in the former case, the spacetime dependence can be discarded, hence neither the states nor the transitions are general covariant and the problem is reduced to that of the nonreltivistic QM. For the same reason, in the latter case, since the spacetime regions are distinct, transition bewteen them are prohibited if general covariance is assured.

Now there are three levels of structures. The first is the space of smearing functions, $\mathscr{E} = \{f\}$, on which one can define a bilinear form by group averaging[14]

$$(f', f)_C = \int d\tau \int dx [f'(x)]^* e^{i\tau C} f(x)$$

where C is the constraint on a presymplectic manifold. The second is the Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_f$ of the spacetime-smeared states $|f\rangle$, the inner product of which can be obtained from $(f, f')_C$ through the propagator W,

$$(f', f)_C = \int dx' \int dx [f'(x)]^* W(x', x) f(x) = \langle f'|f\rangle .$$

[5] In condition (2), since the modulus square makes the probability spacetime symmetric, the problem of *retrodictions* is avoided at the level of probabilities.

[6] In contrast to nonrelativistic QM, we have used the particle state Ψ instead of an operator to study the observation. This is in fact a feature of transition probability spaces where we have shifted from operators acting on states to transition probabilities between states. Indeed, in general covariant QM, the time ordering of multiple measurements is lost and instead, it is encoded into the relations between those measurement devices (see, e.g. Ref. [36]). So even if one has the operators representing those devices, one still need to know the relations between them to avoid paradoxes. Hence such a shift is suitable for general covariant QM.

These actually form a Gelfand triple $\mathscr{E} \subset \mathscr{H} \subset \mathscr{H}_f$ where $\mathscr{H}$ is the Hibert space of unsmeared states. The general covariant relativistic QM at this level is well-accepted and standardized in Rovelli's book[37]. The third is the space $\mathscr{H}_{\mathscr{R}}$ of spacetime states, whose inner product $\langle \mathscr{R}|\mathscr{R}'\rangle$ makes it a transition amplitude space. Although we have worked with this older (non-standard) version of covariant QM, they are equivalent to each other in the categorical sense. More explicitly, take $\mathscr{E}$ as a subcategory of the category **Set** consisting of small sets (of f) and funcions (or inner products) between them, and suppose, for the moment (c.f. Sec. 4 for a categorification), that the state subspaces in the Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_f$ (or $\mathscr{H}_{\mathscr{R}}$) together with the transition probabilities form a category **Hf** (or **Hr**). Then consider the following diagram,



where i is the identity functor, $s : \mathbf{Hr} \to \mathbf{Hf}$ is the functor that effectively forgets the dependence on the time coordinate, and $a : \mathbf{Hf} \to \mathbf{Set}$ is a representable functor. Note that by the Yoneda lemma the right Kan extension $v \equiv \mathrm{Ran}_i(a \circ s)$ of the largest triangle diagram is valid, hence this diagram is commutative and defines a point-wise right Kan extension $u \equiv \mathrm{Ran}_i(s)$. This u is the limit of $(\{|\mathscr{R}\rangle\} \downarrow \mathbf{Hr}) \to \mathbf{Hr} \to \mathbf{Hf}$ (cf. Theorem X.3.1. of [20]), and since i is just the idenity functor and hence fully faithful, the Kan extension is universal and defines a natural isomorphism between pair of functors $\varepsilon : u \circ i = u \cong s$ (cf. Corollary X.3.3. of [20]), which simply means that the categories **Hr** and **Hf** are categorically equivalent.

3.2. **General covariant quantum theory II: timeless path integrals.** The general covariant QM considered above (or in Ref. [37]) is in a canonical formulation. When passing to the path integral formultion, the timeless feature of relativisitc QM obscures the construction. In Ref. [15] this difficulty is overcame by group averaging over a time parameter with which the transition amplitude is written as a path integral similar to the case with time. For simplicity, we start directly from this timeless path integral.

Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the configuration space with coordinates $\{q^a\}$. The cotangent space $T^*\mathscr{C}$ of $\mathscr{C}$ is the phase space with coordinates $\{q^a, p_a\}$. On a curve γ in $T^*\mathscr{C}$ one can define an action $S[\gamma] = \int_\gamma p_a dq^a$. A physical motion is obtained by extremizing $S[\gamma]$ over those γ on the constraint surface defined by $H = 0$. In quantum theory the coordinates become partial obervables $\hat{q}^a, \hat{p}_a$ with respective eigenstates $|q^a\rangle, |p_a\rangle$. The constraint operator $\hat{H}$ defines a projector $\hat{P} = \int d\tau \exp[-i\tau\hat{H}]$ from a kinematical Hilbert space to the physical Hilbert space.

Definition 3.4 (Chiou[15])**.** The transition amplitude $W(q^a, q'^a) = \langle q^a|\hat{P}|q'^a\rangle$ from $|q'^a\rangle$ to $|q^a\rangle$ is the following path integral

$$W(q^a, q'^a) = N \int \mathscr{D}q^a \int \mathscr{D}p_a \delta[H] \exp\Big[\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_\gamma p_a dq^a\Big]$$

where N is a normalization factor, $\delta[H]$ confines the curve to the constraint surface such that it connects q^a and q'^a when restricted to $\mathscr{C}$, and the functional measures

are defined as in the ordinary case, (assuming N partitions of $[0,\tau]$)

$$\int \mathscr{D}q^a \triangleq \prod_{n=1}^{N-1}\int d^d q_n^a, \quad \int \mathscr{D}p_a \triangleq \prod_{n=1}^{N-1}\int \frac{d^d p_{na}}{(2\pi\hbar)^d}, \quad d=\dim\mathscr{C}.$$

Now the properties of path integrals manifests the following.

Lemma 3.5. *The path integral $W(q^a,q'^a)$ is a transition amplitude.*

Proof. We give a formal demonstration here. First, $W(q^a,q^a)=1$ is manifested form the origianl expression, $\langle q^a|\hat{P}|q^a\rangle = \langle q^a|q^a\rangle = 1$ if $|q^a\rangle$ is a normalized physical state. Second, consider the composition of two pathes $\gamma_2\cup\gamma_1$ where γ_1 connects q^a to q'^a and γ_2 connects q'^a to q''^a when restricted to $\mathscr{C}$. Then by definition, the sum over all possible middle points q'^a is equivalent to calculating the path integral from q^a to q''^a, namely,

$$\int_{q'^a} W(q^a,q'^a)W(q'^a,q''^a) = W(q^a,q''^a) = N'\int \mathscr{D}q^a \int \mathscr{D}p_a\delta[H]\exp\Big[\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{\gamma_1\cup\gamma_2} p_a dq^a\Big].$$

Now the convergence of the path integral is an elusive issue. In most cases the normalization factor N will render $0\leqslant W\leqslant 1$. □

A mathematically rigorous proof of this lemma will depend on the specific mathematical approach one chooses to define path integrals (cf. [38]). In fact, these properties of W have already been utilized in the last subsection. One can define the probability of finding $|q^a\rangle$ supported on a spacetime region $\mathscr{R}$ given the $|q'^a\rangle$ on $\mathscr{R}'$ to be

$$P(q^a,\mathscr{R};q'^a,\mathscr{R}') = \Big|\frac{W(\mathscr{R},\mathscr{R}')}{\sqrt{W(\mathscr{R},\mathscr{R})}\sqrt{W(\mathscr{R}',\mathscr{R}')}}\Big|^2,$$

where

$$W(\mathscr{R},\mathscr{R}') = \int_{\mathscr{R}} dq^a \int_{\mathscr{R}'} dq'^a W(q^a,q'^a).$$

Other than spacetime regions, $\mathscr{R}$ could also be the regions in the spectra of q^a, then we have a result similar to Theorem 3.3. with a similar proof,

Theorem 3.6. *The physical Hilbert space ($\mathscr{H}_f$) projectd out by $\hat{P}$ together with the probability $P(q^a,\mathscr{R};q'^a,\mathscr{R}')$ defines a transition probability space.*

3.3. **General boundary fomulation of quantum theories.** The general boundary formulation of quantum theory proposed in Ref. [16] is designed to describe a quantum theory in terms of state spaces on boundaries of regions of spacetime and transition amplitudes between them. This formulation inherits the structures of a topological quantum field theory(TQFT), but they are also suitable for describing non-topological theories such as QM.

In general, the general boundary formulation consists of regions M of spacetime and their boundary hypersurfaces $S\equiv\partial M$. On each S is defined a space $\mathscr{H}_S$ of states, and on each region M is assigned an amplitude $Z(M)\in\mathbb{C}$. These data $(\mathscr{H}_S, Z(M))$ satisfy the following (TQFT) axioms (1), (2) and the quantization axiom (3):

(1) *involution*. The dual space $\mathscr{H}_S^*$ of $\mathscr{H}_S$ is obtained by changing the orientation of S. Now the amplitude $Z(M)$ defines a map $Z(M):\mathscr{H}_S\to\mathscr{H}_S^*$, or a cobordism $Z(M)=\langle\mathscr{H}_S^*,\mathscr{H}_S\rangle$.

(2) *multiplication*. For disjoint components of $S = \cup_i S_i$, the state space is a tensor product of each, $\mathscr{H}_S = \otimes_i \mathscr{H}_{S_i}$. For two spacetime regions M_1, M_2 sharing a common boundary S_3, if M_1 has another boundary S_1 and M_2 a S_2, the gluing $M = M_1 \cup_{S_3} M_2$ gives $Z(M) = Z(M_2) \circ Z(M_1)$, where $Z(M_1) : \mathscr{H}_{S_1} \to \mathscr{H}_{S_3}$ and $Z(M_2) : \mathscr{H}_{S_3} \to \mathscr{H}_{S_1}$. If $S_3 = \emptyset$, then $Z(M) = Z(M_2) \otimes Z(M_1)$.

(3) *holographic quantization*. The space K_S of field configurations ϕ on S with an action $\mathscr{S}$ determines a classical solution inside M. Then $\mathscr{H}_S$ is the space $C(K_S)$ of of complex valued functions on K_S. For any state $\psi \in \mathscr{H}_S$, the amplitude is

$$Z(M)[\psi] = \int_{K_S} \mathscr{D}\phi_0 \psi(\phi_0) \Big(\int_{\phi|_S = \phi_0} \mathscr{D}\phi e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\mathscr{S}[\phi]} \Big) \equiv \int \mathscr{D}\phi_0 \psi(\phi_0) Z(M)$$

where $\phi_0 \in K_S$ and ϕ is the field configurations inside M.

Note that the functorial axiom of TQFT[39] is implicit in the assignment of state spaces and amplitudes. One can readily check that the generic data $(C(K_S), Z(M))$ in (3) satisfy the requirement of (1) and (2), and hence this formulation goes beyond a TQFT.

For a quantum theory described by a Hilbert space, such as QM and QFT, one can construct the following general boundary formulation. The regions are chosen as $\Sigma \times [t_1, t_2]$ where Σ is the spatial part and the time interval indicates that the boundaries are the time-slices S_1, S_2. Then obviously $\mathscr{H}_{S_1} = \mathscr{H}^*_{S_2}$ and for a pair of states $\psi \in \mathscr{H}_{S_1}, \phi \in \mathscr{H}_{S_2}$, the amplitude is the usual transition amplitude $\langle \phi | U(t_2, t_1) | \psi \rangle$ where U is the unitary evolution operator. Now the difference come in the holographic quantization: the configuration space K_S, the way of choosing $C(K_S)$ and the representation of amplitudes. In the case of QFT, the spacetime regions Ms are those in the Minkowski spactime and the boundaries Ss are general hypersurfaces, not necessarily spacelike (because of background independence), in the Minkowski spacetime.

In the general boundary formulation of quantum theory, probabilities can be defined conditionally[40]. Let $\mathscr{P} \subset \mathscr{H}_S$ be the subspace of states representing the preparations, and $\mathscr{O} \subset \mathscr{H}_S$ be the observations. Then the probability of observing $\mathscr{O}$ given the preparations $\mathscr{P}$ is

$$P(\mathscr{O}|\mathscr{P}) = \frac{|Z(M) \circ P_{\mathscr{P}} \circ P_{\mathscr{O}}|^2}{|Z(M) \circ P_{\mathscr{P}}|^2} = \frac{\sum_i |Z(M)[\psi_i]|^2}{\sum_j |Z(M)[\phi_j]|^2}$$

where $P_{\mathscr{P}}, P_{\mathscr{O}}$ are projectors onto the subspaces and ψ_i, ϕ_j are orthonormal bases of $\mathscr{O}$ and $\mathscr{P}$ respectively. Suppose the usual case of time-slices as above, then the conditional probability recovers the conventional form $P(\mathscr{O}|\mathscr{P}) = |\langle \phi | U(t_2, t_1) | \psi \rangle|^2$ if we choose as cobordisms in $\mathscr{H}_{S_1} \otimes \mathscr{H}_{S_2}$, $\mathscr{P} = \phi \otimes \mathscr{H}_{S_2}$ and $\mathscr{O} = \mathscr{H}_{S_2} \otimes \psi$. In fact, this probability defines a transition probability between states on different boundaries.

Theorem 3.7. *Given a spacetime region M with boundaries S_i, the data $(\mathscr{H}_{S_i}, P(.|.))$ define a transition probability space.*

Proof. Now the state spaces should be the class $\{\mathscr{H}_{S_i}\}$ of boundary spaces of states. Then conditions (1) and (3) of Definition 2.1 are easily satisfied. (Cf. Ref. [40].) The symmetry condition is satisfied because of the crossing symmetry in defining the amplitudes. □

To see that the general boundary formulation includes both QM and quantum gravity, consider the following examples.

Example 3.8. An immediate example is the transition amplitude between two arbitary (not necessarily those eigenstates $|q^a\rangle$) states $|\psi_\alpha\rangle$ and $|\psi_\beta\rangle$ in general covariant QM,

$$W(\psi_\beta,\psi_\alpha)=\langle\psi_\beta|\hat{P}|\psi_\alpha\rangle=\int dq^a\int dq'^a\,\langle\psi_\beta|q^a\rangle\langle q^a|\hat{P}|q'^a\rangle\langle q'^a|\psi_\alpha\rangle\equiv$$
$$\equiv\int dq^a\int dq'^a\psi^*_\beta(q^a)\psi_\alpha(q'^a)W(q^a,q'^a)$$

which is exactly the quantization axiom (3). From this, we clearly see the necessity of smearing a quantum state over a spacetime region (or a hypersurface here) in order that the general covariant QM can be formulated in the general boundary formulation.

Example 3.9. In LQG, the n-point function is defined in the general boundary formulation[41]. Consider a surface Σ in flat spacetime, bounding a compact non-flat region $\mathscr{R}$, and approximate the n-point function by replacing the action $S[g]$ outside $\mathscr{R}$ with linearized ones. Let γ be the value of the field on Σ, $W_\Sigma[\gamma]$ the internal integral defined by

$$W_\Sigma[\gamma]=\int_{\varphi\lceil_\Sigma=\gamma}\mathscr{D}\varphi e^{S_{\mathscr{R}}[\varphi]},\quad \mathrm{supp}\varphi\subset\mathscr{R},$$

and $\Psi_\Sigma[\gamma]$ the outside integral defined alike, then the n-point function is

$$W(x_1,...,x_N)\sim\int\mathscr{D}\gamma W_\Sigma[\gamma]\gamma(x_1)...\gamma(x_N)\Psi[\gamma]\equiv\langle W_\Sigma|\gamma(x_1)...\gamma(x_N)|\Psi_\Sigma\rangle\,.$$

Here we have two regions intersecting the real boundary Σ, but the integral still satisfies the quantization axiom (3).

3.4. **Spin foams.** A spin foam model defines the transition amplitudes, or partition functions, between 3-geometries as a "sum over geometries".

$$Z=\sum_{\mathfrak{m}\in\mathfrak{M}}W(\mathfrak{m})A(\mathfrak{m})$$

where the $\mathfrak{m}$ are spin foam "molecules" constituting the spin foam (see Ref. [42] or Appendix A for the definition), the W are the measures or weights of $\mathfrak{m}$ and the A are the geometric amplitudes of $\mathfrak{m}$.

Despite the geometric forms, the spin foam amplitudes Z should keep the properties of transition amplitudes, or n-point functions, between spin network states. In fact, they are exactly the transition amplitudes in a group field theory(GFT) and the group fields correspond to the spin networks on 3-geometries[43, 44]. At the formal level, this is well illustrated by the second quantization formulation of GFT[45]. Therein the spin networks (Γ,j,i), on which the canonical LQG is based, are cut into disjoint *open spin network vertices* (V,j) whose edges can be glued again to recover the original spin networks. On these spin network vertices are assigned a function of group elements in G,[7]

$$\varphi(g_1^1,g_1^2,...,g_1^d,...,g_v^1,g_v^2,...,g_v^d)\equiv\varphi(\vec{g}_1,...,\vec{g}_v),\quad d=\dim\{j\},\ v=\dim\{V\}.$$

[7]Here the valences of all vertices are taken to be the same, that is, we are considering d-simplical graphs. The extension to arbitrary valent complexes are possible and can be found in Ref. [42].

The cylindrical functions constituting the Hilbert space of canonical LQG can be obtained by group averaging φ over the group $G(=\mathrm{SU}(2)$ usually). Then the Hilbert space of LQG can be written as a direct sum of individual Hilbert spaces on open spin network vertices, $\mathscr{H} = \oplus_{v\in V}\mathscr{H}_v$. Now by second quantization we mean that the function $\varphi(\vec{g}_1,...,\vec{g}_v)$ is a v-partite many-body wave function with each single particle state living in $\mathscr{H}_v$, so that each many-body state can be decomposed into products of single particle states,

$$|\varphi\rangle = \sum_{i\in V}\varphi(\vec{g}_1,...,\vec{g}_v)\,|\vec{\chi}_1\rangle\,|\vec{\chi}_2\rangle\,...\,|\vec{\chi}_v\rangle$$

where $\langle\vec{g}|\vec{\chi}\rangle$ is the wave function for a single spin network vertex. This makes $\mathscr{H}$ into a Fock space, and the occupation number is just the number of edges attaching an open spin network vertex so that one can define the occupation number representation,

$$\langle\vec{g}|\varphi\rangle = \sum_{i\in V}\varphi(\vec{g}_1,...,\vec{g}_v)\prod_i\langle\vec{g}_i|\vec{\chi}_i\rangle \equiv \sum_{n_i}C(n_1,...,n_a,...)\,\langle\vec{g}|n_1,...,n_i,...\rangle\,.$$

As in the usual second quantization, one can introduce creation and annihilation oprators $a^\dagger_{\vec{\chi}}$, $a_{\vec{\chi}}$ generating these occupation number states, and the resulting field operators $\hat{\varphi} = \sum_{\vec{\chi}} a_{\vec{\chi}}\varphi$ are just the field operators in GFT. In this sense the transition amplitudes will take the conventional QM forms[44, 45]

$$Z = \langle\psi|\varphi\rangle = \langle\varphi|e^{iS}|\varphi\rangle = \sum_\Gamma W(\Gamma)A(\Gamma),$$

where in the last expression the Γ is the perturbative Feynman diagram in GFT and one has $A(\Gamma) = A(\mathfrak{m})$ for some $\mathfrak{m}$. Hence all the conditions for tansition probability spaces are formally satisfied.

At a more sophisticated level, in order to find the structures of transition probability spaces, we can put the spin foam models into the general boundary formulation. Indeed, in the EPRL spin foam model, states on the boundary 3-geometries match the spin network states in canonical LQG. Now the integral kernal $Z(M)$ in the quantization axiom is the spin foam sum determined by the projected spin networks on the boundary. Such a $Z(M)$ is shown in Ref.[17] to preserve the composition of cobordisms. Hence the EPRL spin foam model admits a general boundary formulation with the boundary state space being that of projected spin networks and with $Z(M)$ the spin foam sum matching the boundary data. Then as a corollary of Theorem 3.7 in the last subsection, we see that they also defines a transition probability space. We refer to Ref. [17] for these details.

Alternatively, one can define transition probability spaces by first identifying the transition amplitude spaces. In EPRL, the spin foam sum is indeed a transition amplitude. An important observation is that the stationary amplitude equals identity since the contractable loops are physically equivalent to the base point.[8] Then preservation of cobordisims by the spin foam sum ensures the requirement of compositions of amplitudes. This is also in line with the holonomy representation of spin foams[47] where the spin foam amplitude can be written as the product of

[8]This is because one must fix the redundant gauge degrees of freedom or incorporate diffeomorphism invariance into the path integral measures of spin foams so as to get an anomaly-free spin foam quantization. See Ref. [46] for arguments based on toy models.

vertex amplitudes and *face* amplitudes

$$Z=\sum_{\mathfrak{m}}\int_G dh_{vf}\prod_v A_v\prod_f \delta\Big(\prod_{v\in f}h_{vf}\Big),\quad v,f\in\mathfrak{m}$$

where h_{vf} is the holonomy along the wedge link. Since the face amplitudes are invariant under local face cuttings (or compositions),

$$\int dh_{ext}\,\delta(h,...,h_{ext})\delta(h',...,h_{ext})=\delta(h,...,h'...),\quad h_{ext}:\text{holonomy along the cut},$$

then the compositions of amplitudes are assured. The finiteness of the amplitude sum can be achieved by choosing suitable normalization of the spin foam sum[48]. Hence the class of A-sets $\mathscr{N}_A$ is nonempty. Furthermore, the resulting transition amplitude space is total as in the proof of theorem 3.3.. A problem might arise as whether the form of transition probabiltiy is the conditional $P(.|.)$. In fact, the combinatorial structures of spin foams[42] can be readily fit into the formulation of the operational quantum theory,[9] so that the transition probability should be defined conditionally (within a cobordism).

Therefore, in either approach one obtains the following result.

Theorem 3.10. *In the EPRL spin foam model, the data $(\mathscr{H}_{S,p},P(.|.))$ consisting of the spaces $\mathscr{H}_{S,p}$ of (projected) spin network states on the boundary S and transition probability $P(.|.)$, define a transition probability space.*

3.5. **Reconstruction of the canonical formalism.** We have briefly argued that the spin foam amplitudes are indeed transition amplitudes in the sense of Definition 2.3. Based on this, we can try to reconstruct the canonical formalism as in the discussion below Definition 2.3. The same idea has already been exploited in Ref. [43] where the spin foam amplitudes are interpreted as the quantum gravitational analogues of Wightman functions in ordinary QFT, and the spin network states as quantum states in QFT. Moreover, the GNS construction is applied to the C^* algebra on the space $\mathscr{A}$ of spin network states together with linear functionals on $\mathscr{A}$. This is a general result for spin foam models, and also holds for the EPRL spin foam model we have discussed above. However, we will see that the transition amplitudes provide a simpler approach, in that we no longer need the QFT analogues to apply the GNS construction.

More explicitly, to define the null sequence one first needs to introduce as before the amplitude functions $A_{s_1}(s_2)=A(s_1,s_2)\equiv Z(s_1,s_2)$ where the s_i denote the spin network states. Then the null sequence condition becomes

$$\sum_i \mathfrak{a}_i A(s_1,s_{2,i})=\sum_i \mathfrak{a}_i A_{s_1}(s_{2,i})=A_{s_1}\Big(\sum_i \mathfrak{a}_i s_{2,i}\Big)=0\quad\Rightarrow\quad\sum_i \mathfrak{a}_i s_{2,i}=0.$$

If one uses the Dupuis-Livine map[49] from the usual SU(2) spin network states to those projected spin network states,

$$s\mapsto\tilde{s}(g)=\int_{SU(2)}dhK(g,h)s(h)\Rightarrow\sum_h \mathfrak{k}_h s_h,\quad g\in SL(2,\mathbb{C}),\ h\in SU(2)$$

where in the sum we have supposed a discrete version of this map just to compare the notations, which is wrong since the group is continuous. Then the null

[9]Such an argument needs futher detailed explanations from which we will refrain. Pointedly stated, the vertices are open spin network vertices in the second quantization formulation of GFT; the wires are edges to be connected; the joint probability is given by the spin foam sum.

sequence condition can be interpreted as the closure constraint imposed on the projected spin networks. Indeed, if one further takes the coherent state representation of SU(2) spin network states[50], then after group-averging over SU(2), the spin network state $|j,n\rangle$ in the so-called spin-normal representation is lablled by the normals n assinged to the triangles of the tetrahedra which satisfy the closure condition. Besides, the map above is reduced to a discrete one in the coherent state representation as desired.

Meanwhile, the spin foam amplitudes are naturally A-forms, since in spin foam models transitions are just relational and hence interchanging s_1 and s_2 gives the same amplitude

$$\sum_i \mathfrak{a}_i A(s_1, s_{2,i}) = \sum_i \mathfrak{a}_i A(s_{2,i}, s_1) = 0$$

for the null sequence $(\mathfrak{a}_i, s_{2,i})$. The bound $\mathfrak{b}$ is definable as in Ref. [48]. Then we have the space $\mathscr{B}$ of bounded linear amplitude functions or A-forms. The product is defined as the composition of amplitudes, the involution as the complex conjugation, and the bound as $||A|| = \inf \mathfrak{b}$ as before. These make $\mathscr{B}$ a C^* algebra, and again there is a C^* isomorphism from $\mathscr{B}$ to those bounded linear operators in the Hilbert space that can be chosen as the GNS construction from the holonomy-flux algebra $\mathfrak{P}$ of spin network states.

Let us turn to the structures of superselection sectors. For a transition probability space (S,p), its superselection sectors are those irreducible subspaces (S_i,p_i), the disjoint union of which compose the whole space $\sqcup_i(S_i,p_i) = (S,p)$. It is superselected in the sense that $p_i(S_i,S_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$. In the context of LQG, spin network states supported on distinct graphs are orthogonal, and hence kinematically one has the direct sum decomposition, $\mathscr{H} = \oplus_\gamma \mathscr{H}_\gamma$. At the dynamical level, the superselection sectors can be defined again by the vanishing of transition probabilities or spin foam amplitudes. In principle, this can be done either in the non-graph-changing or graph-changing case, since in both cases the spin foam amplitudes are definable. This way the pertinent Hilbert space can be rendered separable.

3.6. **The logic of quantum gravity.** Any quantum theory of gravity presuming the correctness of QM remains a theory of QM, thereby the structures of quantum logic should be preserved. We have seen in the above subsections that LQG, especially the spin foam models, can be described alternatively by transition probability (or amplitude) spaces. Then constructing the quantum logic of LQG is now a conceptually trivial task, which is mathematically the same as those in Ref. [23, 51].[10] What we want to do is to find the quantum logics directly from the structures of LQG. To this end, one could start from the Hilbert space of cylindrical functions in canonical LQG. Mathematically, this should not be different from those in the Hilbert space representation theorem for quantum logics[2, 24, 26]. We will, inspite of being less rigorous, consider physically the spin foams as 4D geons in Appendix A.

Since the Hilbert lattice of a finite dimensional Hilbert space is modular, there is no need for a continuous geometry. In LQG the Hilbert space of cylindrical

[10] Note that obtaining quantum logics from transition probabilities seems to be different from the procedure of deriving quantum logics from the multidimensional probabilities or S-probabilities[52] for the state space S. However, in analogy to the fact the transition measures[6, 27] defining the generalized transition probablities are constructed from the probability measures for two single events, these reconstructions of logical structures are indeed equivalent.

functions is finite, so why should we care about the quantum logic of quantum gravity? In fact, infinite-dimensional spaces arise in the studies of semiclassical limit using e.g. infinite tensor product construction[13]. In such cases, quantum logical structures will make clear the quantum-classical distinction or transition.

4. Categorical Characterizations

In this section we explore possible categorical characterizations of transition probability spaces and spin foams. Many cases that we will consider are not new, but will still be interesting from the perspective of transition probability spaces.

4.1. **Categorification of a transition probability space.** The categorical characterization of transition probabilities was first considered by Uhlmann in Ref. [53]. Therein the objects and morphisms (or arrows) are defined respectively as the states and the transition probabilities between states. For two different sets A and B of states that are causally related, or simply for two C^* algebras connected by a completely positive map K, the t-functor is defined by exactly the map K. We denote this category by **TPS**. In this category the hom-set $hom(a,b)$ of morphisms between two objects a and b has at least two arrows, since given a usual transition probability one can construct Cantoni's generalized transition probability from it. In this sense, one can define the category $\mathbf{TP}(a,b)$ of transition probabilities between states a and b with the different transition probabilities T (in the generalized sense) as objects and the transformations between them as arrows. **TP** is not necessarily the two-object category **2**, since there is a large set of distance measures for quantum states[25]. Then **TP** also satisfy the conditions in Definition 2.1, since every object in **TP** satisfies them, which means that **TPS** is a 2-category with states as 0-cells, transition probabilities as 1-cells, and arrows in **TP** as 2-cells, i.e.

$$\mathscr{H}_a \underset{T}{\overset{p}{\Downarrow t}} \mathscr{H}_b \underset{T'}{\overset{p'}{\Downarrow t'}} \mathscr{H}_c, \quad t,t' \in \mathbf{TP}.$$

On the other hand, the spin foam also defines a category **SF** where the objects are spin network states on quantum 3-geometries and the morphisms are the *equivalence classes* of spinfoams relating the spin network states. In Ref. [18], the equivalence relation is defined by (i) affine transformations; (ii) subdivisions; (iii) orientation reversal of the spin foams. A moment of reflection shows that the operation of subdivisions is just the condition (3) of Definition 2.1, and the orientation reversal is the condition (2). The affine transformations do not change the cells of the complexes on which the spin foams are based, so that the transition probabilities or the spin foam amplitudes remain intact. In order to identify the 2-cells in **SF**, consider the description of spin foams via branched coverings as in Ref. [19]. Recall that a branched covering of a three-manifold W is a submersion $p : W \to S^3$ of W into the three-sphere such that the covering is trivial when the graph Γ embedded in S^3, the branched locus, is deleted. Two branched covering of three-manifolds W_0, W_1 along two distinct graphs Γ_0, Γ_1 can be related by a branched cover cobordism M such that $\partial M = W_0 \otimes W_1^*$. The branched covering of M, $q : M \to S^3 \times [0,1]$, reduces to those of W_i, $i = 0,1$ when restricted to $S^3 \times \{0\}$ or $S^3 \times \{1\}$. In the context of LQG, the spin networks (Γ, j, i) embedded in a three-geometry W_i play the role of brached loci. For two spin networks based on the graphs Γ, Γ', there is a

branched covering of some three-manifold W connecting them,

$$\Gamma \subset S^3 \leftarrow W \rightarrow S^3 \supset \Gamma'$$

which is in fact the 2-cell relating the two spin foams emanating from Γ, Γ'. The concept of cobordism we have used above to give the transition amplitude $Z(M)$ is in fact the four-manifold M such that there is a branched cover cobordism defining the spin foam,

$$\Sigma \subset S^3 \times [0,1] \leftarrow M \rightarrow S^3 \times [0,1] \supset \Sigma'$$

where Σ and Σ' satisfying respectively $\partial\Sigma = \Gamma_0 \otimes \Gamma_1^*$ and $\partial\Sigma' = \Gamma_0' \otimes \Gamma_1'^*$ are branched loci of W. Therefore, **SF** is a 2-category with the 2-cells defined by the branched covers.[11]

By the theorems of the last section, one has a faithful functor $\tau : \mathbf{SF} \rightarrow \mathbf{TPS}$ such that the description of spin foams by transition probabilities defines an equivalence of categories. However, there are properties that are not shown in transition probability spaces. For instance, the causality is not shown in transition probability spaces and only becomes explicit when there are further operational inputs as shown in §2.4. Besides, since the (spin network) states are evolving under transitions, the transition probabilities can not tell us whether the properties of the states are preserved. To find these deeper structures, let us discuss more categorical characterizations.

4.2. **State and property transitions.** We have seen in §2.4. that in order to be consistent with the operational quantum theory, one has to define the transition probability conditionally. Let $\mathscr{H}$ be the Hilbert space of states, $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ be the Hilbert lattice with as partial order the subspace projections in $\mathscr{H}$, and $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ be the power set of $\mathscr{H}$. Then for an initial state space $\mathscr{H}$, each subspace $\mathscr{S} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ represents a possible transition probability $P = \mathrm{tr}(WP_{\mathscr{S}})/\mathrm{tr}(WP_{\mathscr{H}})$ conditioned on $\mathscr{H}$. The following characterization of state transitions is due to Coecke and Stubbe[55]. We include it here for clarification of the above-mentioned problems.

Define the *operational resolution* $\mathscr{C} : \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}) \rightarrow \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ that preserves the partial order of $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ defined by subset inclusions. In other words, $\mathscr{C}$ is a left adjoint of the embedding functor from $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ to the Boolean algebra formed by subset inclusions in $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ such that the disjunction is definable for $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ in the ambient $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$. The reason that we have used the word "functor" will be clear in the following.

In the current case, the operational resolution is simply the map $\mathscr{C} : \mathscr{T} \mapsto \cup\mathscr{T}$ from $\mathscr{T}$ to the join of all $\mathscr{T} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$. Now given two state spaces $\mathscr{H}_1$ and $\mathscr{H}_2$, one can write a general state transition as

$$f : \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_2), \quad \text{such that } f(\cup_i \mathscr{T}_i) = \cup_i f(\mathscr{T}_i),\ \forall \mathscr{T} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_1).$$

Notice that f is probabilisitic in the sense that it maps an initial subspace in $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_1)$ into all possible subspaces in $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_2)$, and hence the join-preserving condition

[11] Another way to get a 2-category is to take into account the category **SN** of spin networks[54] with vertices as objects and edges as arrows. Now the 2-morphisms are just spin foams connecting the spin network states. In this approach the vertices are taken as objects, which spoils analogy with the transition probability spaces. Also notice that in Ref. [19] the 2-category for (top)spin foams are defined by as objects the (top)spin networks, as 1-morphism the branched coverings and as 2-morphisms(/cells) the branched covering cobordisms. Here we have exchange the definitions of 1- and 2- morphisms to fit into the framework of transition probabilty spaces.

corresponds to σ-additivity of probabilistic measures. These maps f form a join-complete lattice with as bottom element the map mapping to the empty set, and as top element the identity. In the physical sense, the union or disjunction of subspaces means the lacking of resolution, i.e. one is not able to distinguish the state transitions to the smaller subspace. Hence one obtains a quantaloid[12] $\mathscr{Q}$ with as objects the data $(\mathscr{H},\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H}),\mathscr{C})$, and as hom-sets the complete lattice formed by f. Then by the propositions proved in Ref. [55], one has the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_1) & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_2) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{C}_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{C}_2} \\ \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H}_1) & \xrightarrow{f_{\mathrm{pr}}} & \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H}_2) \end{array}$$

This means that the probabilisitc state transition f will induce the definite property transition f_{pr}[13] between the property lattices.

Notice that the state transition function f is probabilistically defined on the classical Boolean algebra in $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$, whereas the transition probability is defined on the Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}$ of states. This can be understood by referring to the relations between the classical and quantum event structures[56]. In fact, since the Boolean algebra in $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ is defined set-theoretically, on $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ one can defined the category of presheaves or topos $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})^{\mathrm{op}}}$. Then the operational resolution $\mathscr{C}$ is the left adjoint of the embedding *functor* from the category of quantum event structure $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ to the topos $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})^{\mathrm{op}}}$, where an object $L\in\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ is mapped to a presheave on $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$. Now the state transition f are transition maps between the Boolean charts which locally cover $\mathscr{L}$. So as on manifolds, the quantum transition probabilities can be obtained from those f between charts. (Cf. Ref. [57] for the fully topos arguments.)

Since we have the quantaloid $\mathscr{Q}$, the enriched categorical structure over $\mathscr{Q}$[58] can now be exploited. First, $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ can be considered as $\mathscr{Q}$-sets labelled by the operational resolution $\mathscr{C}$, so that $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ becomes a $\mathscr{Q}$-category with as arrows the f between its elements. Then a presheaf on the $\mathscr{Q}$-category $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ is the distributor from $*_{\mathfrak{h}}$ to $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$ where $*_{\mathfrak{h}}$ is the one-object $\mathscr{Q}$-category of $\mathfrak{h}\in\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$. Intuitively a distributor is a matrix of transition functions $f(\mathfrak{a}_1\to\mathfrak{b}_2),\mathfrak{a}_1\in\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_1),\mathfrak{b}_2\in\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_2)$ that plays the role of an arrow between two $\mathscr{Q}$-categories. Hence as expected the presheaves relate the local structure to the global ones. Now these allow us to explain the classical germs mentioned before. Consider again the operational resolution $\mathscr{C}$. If the quantum logic $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ tends to a classical Boolean lattice $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{B})$, then $\mathscr{C}$ is a set-theoretic bijection and hence one has the bijection a between the two $\mathscr{Q}$-presheaves

$$\begin{array}{ccc} *_{\mathfrak{h}} & \xrightarrow{a} & * \\ \Big|{\scriptstyle \text{distr.}} & & \Big|{\scriptstyle \text{ident. distr.}\in Y[\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{B})]} \\ \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\ \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}) & \xrightarrow{\text{bijection } \mathscr{C}} & \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{B}) \end{array}$$

[12] A quantaloid is a category of which every hom-set is a join-complete lattice with the composition of joins being distributive. More precisely, it is a category enriched over a symmetric monoidal closed join-complete lattice.

[13] Note that one cannot tell whether this is the transition probability, hence it is only a simple map.

where $Y[\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{B})]$ is the Yoneda embedding of the $\mathscr{Q}'$-sets $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{B})$ induced by the identity distributor, where the quantaloid $\mathscr{Q}'$ is defined as before only with $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H})$ replaced by $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{B})$. Therefore, in the classical limit the transition functions for quantum states can be identified to be the state transitions f between the Boolean presheaves on $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H})$. If one takes the bottom f as zero, then $f(\mathfrak{a}\to\mathfrak{b})=\delta_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}}$ in this limit, i.e. a classical germ.

Returning to spin foams, we have seen in the last section that the subspaces of concern are those subspaces of a tensor product space (or a cobordism) $\mathscr{H}_1\otimes\mathscr{H}_2$. However, since the work of D. Aerts[59], we know that separated compound quantum states can not be described by the property lattice of a tensor product of Hilbert spaces. A possible way out is to still work with the quantaloid $\mathscr{Q}$, and then to reconstruct the tensor product Hilbert space[60]. More explicitly, for two Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}_1$ and $\mathscr{H}_2$ constituting the product space $\mathscr{H}_1\otimes\mathscr{H}_2$, one can form the quantaloid $\mathscr{Q}$ with two objects corresponding to $\mathscr{H}_1$ and $\mathscr{H}_2$. The hom-set $\mathscr{Q}(\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_1),\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{H}_2))$ of state transitions induces the property transitions $\mathscr{Q}(\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H}_1),\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{H}_2))$ which as a complete lattice has the atomic bottom map that maps atoms to atoms or zero. Such an atomic map further induces a linear operator $F\in B(\mathscr{H}_1,\mathscr{H}_2)$ mapping $\mathscr{H}_1$ to $\mathscr{H}_2$. Then by the following isomorphisms,

$$\mathscr{H}_1'\otimes\mathscr{H}_2\cong B(\mathscr{H}_1,\mathscr{H}_2),\quad B'(\mathscr{H}_1,\mathscr{H}_2)\cong\mathscr{H}_1\otimes\mathscr{H}_2$$

where the prime denotes the dual space, one recovers the product Hilbert space. Now in the case of cobordisms, the state transition between the individual entities (or subsystems) is manifested by the transition probability given in the last section, which also avoids the case of interaction-free subsystems. Therefore, in the current case the property transitions are reflected in the transitions between individual subsystems, whereas the compound state transitions can be defined directly on the compound system.

4.3. **Braiding and causality.** Note that the above tensor product $\otimes$ is used as in TQFT to combine the lower dimensional boundary manifolds of a cobordism. One can further define the Gray tensor product in the 2-category **SF** of spin foams to make it monoidal. Take as an example the disjoint product $\sqcup$ of state spaces supported on disjoint patches of the spatial (Cauchy) surface, $\mathscr{H}_1\sqcup\mathscr{H}_2$, then it is possible for two spin foams first to intertwine with each other and then split into the transposed product $\mathscr{H}_2\sqcup\mathscr{H}_1$. This is a kind of braiding of two spin foams, which leads to anyon statistics even if we are in $(3+1)$-dimension.[14] This situation is similar to that in topological quantum computation where one is trying to find 3D topological phases evolving in $(3+1)$-dimensional spacetime. A possible description of such braidings is the loop braid group (see, e.g. Ref. [63]), which includes the above intuitive example (as leapfrogging, c.f. Fig.1). There are of course more complicated braidings in 3D topological phases such as three-string braidings (see, e.g. Refs. [64, 65, 66]). For instance, the three-string links can be

[14] Recall that braiding already exists in spin networks in the way[61] that two different edges connecting two vertices can be braided, and twisted if the edges are framed. The evolutions of such braidings are described by dual Pachner moves, which is consistent with the spin foam models as the evolving spin networks. However, B. Bahr[62] showed that in the EPRL model the braidings of the internal edges do not change the spin foam amplitudes. This is obvious, if one takes the spin foams as the path integrals of LQG, from the fact that arbitrary deformations of the internal paths will not change the path integral as long as the boundary data are fixed. It is of course possible to study the topologically inequivalent windings of path around defects, but this situation is not clear in LQG.



FIGURE 1. Three-string braidings in loop braidings. At *a* and *b* there are leapfroggings, and the red circle *c* makes *a*-*b*-*c* a three-string link.

found in the multiple nested loop braidings as in Fig.1. Returning to spin foams, we can easily envisage how such loop braidings weave the whole spacetime.

To see the deeper implications, we borrow the observation of J. C. Wang *et al*[67] that braidings are spacetime surgeries. In the current framework, since the 2-morphisms relating the spin foams in **SF** are defined by coverings of the three-geometries branched over the spin networks, the braiding operation γ on spin foams can be described either by the braiding of the ribbon surfaces in the branching set, or by the Kirby diagrams as in the surgery theory of manifolds. In Ref. [68] it is shown that both descriptions correspond bijectively to a braided monoidal category, so the braiding operations are indeed spacetime surgeries even when we are considering the quantum spacetime.[15]

Caution that further analogies might not hold because the the spin foams are evolutions and the effects of braidings could be absent in spin foam amplitudes. The point is that the $(3+1)$-dimensional gravity is *not* topological, so one cannot transplant everything in topological matter to gravity. Therefore, in the following we turn from quantum statistics of braidings to causality of spin foams, and *suppose* that **SF** is symmetric, i.e. γ is idempotent $\gamma^2 = 1$, without going into these subtleties.

Suppose we have a symmetric monoidal 2-category **SF**, then we can include causality to form causal categories[70]. Recall that a causal category is a symmetric monoidal category whose unit object 1 is terminal. A causal category is normalized if the terminal arrows $T_A : A \to 1$ form a comma category $(\{A\}, 1)$ of objects over the terminal object 1. The category **SF** of spin foams is evidently normalized if the transition probabilities are defined conditionally via Bayesian inversion. Indeed, from the conditional definition of transition probabilities, one can consider the conditional subspace inclusions as set inclusions so that the forgetful functor

[15]In colored GFTs, surgeries on the ribbon (Feynman) graphs also reconstructs closed surfaces. Cf. Ref. [69].

$\mathbf{SF} \to \mathbf{Set}$ creates colimits. Now consider the identity functor $1_{\mathbf{SF}} : \mathbf{SF} \to \mathbf{SF}$, then the existence of colimits implies that there is a left Kan extension $\mathrm{Lan}_G 1_{\mathbf{SF}}$ along the functor $G : \mathbf{SF} \to \mathbf{1}$ which is from **SF** to the category of unit object,



then by the formal criteria for the existence of adjoints, $\mathrm{Lan}_G 1_{\mathbf{SF}}$ is the right adjoint of G. From the above diagram we can infer that the colimit of $1_{\mathbf{SF}}$ is the unit object 1, so if G is taken to be the diagonal functor, then the terminal object is the unit object, $\mathrm{Lan}_G 1_{\mathbf{SF}}(1) = \mathrm{Colim} 1_{\mathbf{SF}}$=1.

Next, there are two ways presented in Ref. [70] to inculde causality: one is by restrcting to the subcategory with causal structure; the other is to combine causal structure with the category. Loosely speaking, the existing ways to build causality into spin foam models in the literature can be classified into the above two classes:

(1) *By restricting*: one can directly put causal restrictions on the vertices of spin networks in such a way that they obey a partial order. See, e.g. Ref. [71]. Such a restrction is recently shown to be due to the fact that the orientations of the *volume 4-vectors* should be restricted by the closure condition for the 4-simplices. So those with opposite orientation with repect to the whole manifold should be discarded. See, e.g. Ref. [72].

(2) *By combining*: as in field theory one can put restrictions on the domain of integration over the proper time in the formal path integral of spin foams. In Ref. [73], a proper time variable is introduced into the GFT, so that restriction can be described by combining the original GFT with it.

In either way, we obtain a causal category where the information flow in this case is represented by the definable transition probability.

There is a caveat that causal category might only be applied in categorical QM, since the creations/annihilations of particles in QFT are not define in category **Hilb** of Hilbert spaces. In the current case, **SF** is more like a TQFT than a categorical QM, so loosely speaking the concept of causal category is still appropriate.

5. Conclusion and Outlook

We have studied the transition probability spaces in LQG and especially in spin foam models. Although they are disadvantageous in calculating concrete quantities when compared to the orthodox quantum formalism, we have seen the advantages in studying structural issues such as the relations between canonical and covariant formalisms, and quantum logical structures.

We have also discussed some categorical structures of the transition probability spaces. However, these discussions are only *elementary* and can be further investigated in the following directions: (i) topos quantum theory, as in Ref. [57]; (ii) higher categories, since one can take the spin networks as 1-category as in Ref. [54] so that **SF** is a 3-category. In addition, the transition probability reminds us of the transition probability in stochastic processes. The transition probability spaces in LQG might open the window to intriguing questions like (i) rigrously constructing path integral for spin foams from stochastic processes as for conventional path integrals[38]; (ii) stochastic quantization of gravity.

Moreover, what we have not yet studied in this work are the various metrics or distances on transition probability spaces in LQG. These distances are useful as the measures for quantum correlations in the Hilbert space formulation. For the quantum entanglement on spin networks, this is manageable as in Ref. [74]. However, now the transition probabilities are defined by spin foam amplitudes, so these distances should measure the *evolving* correlations, or correlations at a coarse-grained level. The situation is similar to the tensor networks where the one gets one dimension higher through the renormalization group flow. But it is not clear whether the description is holographic as the Ryu-Takayanagi formula, because on the one hand, as we have mentioned above, at the level of spin foam amplitudes the structures of spin networks could be wiped out; on the other hand, these distances are between the transition probabilities instead of states, and the spin foam sums do not say much about the "bulk" states or geometries. If one only considers spin networks states on boundary 3-geometries, then the causal evolution would be a fine-graining with finer triagulations instead of coarse-graing, hence one should be careful in relating these theories.

Finally, since the transition probability spaces can be interpreted operationally, we have to mention the recent beautiful work of L. Hardy[75] where an operational framework for gravity is systematically developed. It would be interesting to study transition probability spaces and categorical structures in that framework.

Acknowledgement. The author thanks Juven C. Wang for helpful comments.

APPENDIX A. SPIN FOAMS AND 4-GEONS

In this appendix, we show that spin foams can be regarded as (qauntum) 4-geons from which quantum logics can be derived. Here the transition probability space no longer plays any role.

Geons are topologically nontrivial regions in spacetime that model the elementary particles. Usually the geons are 3D, while in Ref. [76] a speculation is proposed that there exists 4D 4-geons such that the quantum logic can be constructed from the spacetime structures of 4-geons. Although alleged as classical, the 4-geons should be the *atoms* of quantum spacetime if the quantum logic is credited as the characteristic feature of a quantum theory. In the following, we argue that spin foams satisfy the essential properties or axioms defining the 4-geons.

Spin foam models can be understood as the description of dynamical evolutions of the boundary spin network states, or directly as the combination of their basic building blocks. Therefore let us recall the combinatorial structures of spin foams[42]. To define a spin foam model, one starts with a set $\mathfrak{C}$ of boundary graphs, the bisected versions $\mathfrak{B}$ of which are obtained by introducing new vertices on each edge of graphs in $\mathfrak{C}$ such that the new vertices are bivalent, i.e. a subdivions of the complexes. Connecting the bisected boundary graphs to a bulk vertex forms a spin foam *atom* $\mathfrak{a}$ with its faces defined by three distinct vertices. These spin foam atoms can be bound to form a spin foam *molecule* $\mathfrak{m}$, if the bounding faces of the atoms have the same numbers of vertices and edges. The spin foam molecules constitute the whole spin foam. With these in mind, we have the following

Proposition A.1. *The spin foam atoms are 4-geons in a quantum spacetime.*

Proof. We have to show that spin foam atoms satisfy the defining axioms of 4-geons conjectured in Ref. [76]. First, the micro-locality[77] of the combinatoric

structures of spin foams saturates the localization property (i.e. Axiom 1 of Ref. [76]). The problem of disordered locality will not arise since we stay in the quantu regime. Second, since a generic spin foam sum depends on the vertex amplitudes, a hypothetical experiment testing the presence of a bulk vertex v in a spin foam atom will give a true/false value only, or a delta function $\delta(v)$. This fulfills particle-like Axiom of Ref. [76].[16] Third, the axioms of state preparation and measurement process of Ref. [76] are now reflected in the bounding of the faces of spin foam atoms, because the bounding maps only identify faces with the same number of vertices and edges, which restricts the possible combinations of atoms forming a spin foam molecule. Since the spin foams themselves are results of the quantization of gravity, such a restriction effectively sets the boundary conditions for possible gravitational solutions. □

With this result, one can proceed as in Ref. [76] to construct an atomic orthomodular lattice of 4-geons, which in turn is the quantum logic of LQG.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Birkhoff, J. von Neumann, The logic of quantum mechanics, Ann. Math. **37**, 823 (1936).
[2] C. Piron, Axiomatique quantique, Helv. Phys. Acta **37**, 439 (1964).
[3] M. Rédei, *Quantum Logic in Algebraic Approach*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1998.
[4] B. Mielnik, Geometry of quantum states, Commun. Math. Phys. **9**, 55 (1968).
[5] J. G. F. Belinfante, Transition probability spaces, J. Math. Phys. **17**, 285 (1976).
[6] V. Cantoni, Generalized "transition probability", Commun. Math. Phys. **44**, 125 (1975).
[7] V. Cantoni, Generalized transition probability, mobility and symmetries, Commun. Math. Phys. **87**, 153 (1982).
[8] S. P. Gudder, Expectation and transition probability, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **20**, 383 (1981).
[9] J. von Neumann, *Continuous Geometry with A Transition Probability*, Memoirs of AMS, No.252, 1981.
[10] J. Gunson, On the algebraic structure of quantum mechanics, Commun. Math. Phys. **6**, 262 (1967).
[11] F. Holik, M. Sáenz, A. Plastino, A discussion on the origin of quantum probabilities, Ann. Phys. **340**, 293 (2014).
[12] A. Perez, *The Spin-Foam Approach to Quantum Gravity*, Living Rev. Relativity, **16**, 3 (2013).
[13] T. Thiemann, *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
[14] M. Reisenberger, C. Rovelli, Spacetime states and covariant quantum theory, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 125016 (2002).
[15] D.-W. Chiou, Timeless path integral for relativistic quantum mechanics, Class. Quantum Grav. **30**, 125004 (2013).
[16] R. Oeckl, A "general boundary" formulation for quantum mechanics and quantum gravity, Phys. Lett. B **575**, 318 (2003).
[17] F. Conrady, L. Freidel, Path integral representation of spin foam models of 4D gravity, Class. Quantum Grav. **25**, 245010 (2008).
[18] J. C. Baez, Spin foam models, Class. Quantum Grav. **15**, 1827 (1998).
[19] D. Denicola, M. Marcolli, A. Z. al-Yasry, Spin foams and noncommutative geometry, Class. Quantum Grav. **27**, 205025 (2010).
[20] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, 2nd edition, Springer, New York, 1998.
[21] A. Uhlmann, The "transition probability" in the state space of a *-algebra, Rep. Math. Phys. **9**, 273 (1976).
[22] P. C. Zabey, Reconstruction theorems in quantum mechanics, Found. Phys. **5**, 323 (1975).

[16] In GFT, these spin foam atoms contribute to the second quantized many-body wave functions as single particle wave functions.

[23] P. C. Deliyannis, Quantum logics derived from asymmetric Mielnik forms, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **23**, 217 (1984).
[24] K. Bugajska, On the representation theorem for quantum logic, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **9**, 93 (1974).
[25] Z.-h. Ma, F.-L. Zhang, J.-L. Chen, Fidelity induced distance measures for quantum states, Phys. Lett. A **373**, 3407 (2009).
[26] S. Pulmannová, Transition probability space, J. Math. Phys. **27**, 1791 (1986).
[27] G. W. Mackey, *Mathematical Foundation of Quantum Mechanics*, Benjamin, New York, 1963.
[28] H. Araki, G. A. Raggio, A remark on transition probability, Lett. Math. Phys. **6**, 237 (1982).
[29] N. P. Landsman, Poisson spaces with a transition probability, Rev. Math. Phys. **9**, 29 (1997).
[30] N. P. Landsman, Classical behavior in quantum mechanics: A transition probability approach, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **10**, 1545 (1996).
[31] S. Pulmannová, Mielnik and Cantoni transition probabilities, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **28**, 711 (1989).
[32] S. Gudder, S. Pulmannová, Transition amplitude spaces, J. Math. Phys. **28**, 376 (1987).
[33] O. Oreshkov, N. J. Cerf, Operational formulation of time reversal in quantum theory, Nature Phys. **11**, 853 (2015).
[34] O. Oreshkov, N. J. Cerf, Operational quantum theory without predefined time, New J. Phys. **18**, 073037 (2016).
[35] B. Coecke, Quantum picturalism, Contemp. Phys. **51**, 59 (2010).
[36] F. Hellmann, M. Mondragon, A. Perez, C. Rovelli, Multi-event probability in general-relativistic quantum mechanics, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 084033 (2007).
[37] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
[38] S. Mazzucchi, *Mathematical Feynman Path Integrals and Their Applications*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2009.
[39] M. Atiyah, Topological quantum field theories, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **68**, 175 (1989).
[40] R. Oeckl, Probabilities in the general boundary formulation, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **67**, 012049 (2007).
[41] L. Modesto, C. Rovelli, Particle scattering in loop quantum gravity, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 191301 (2005).
[42] D. Oriti, J. P. Ryan, J. Thürigen, Group field theories for all loop quantum gravity, New. J. Phys. **17**, 023042 (2015).
[43] A. Perez, C. Rovelli, Observables in quantum gravity, in *Quanta of Maths*, ed. by E. Blanchard *et al*, pp.501, AMS, 2011.
[44] A. Miković, Quantum field theory of spin networks, Class. Quantum Grav. **18**, 2827 (2001).
[45] D. Oriti, Group field theory as the second quantization of loop quantum gravity, Class. Quantum Grav. **33**, 085005 (2016).
[46] M. Bojowald, A. Perez, Spin foam quantization and anomalies, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **42**, 877 (2010).
[47] E. Magliaro, C. Perini, Local spin foams, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **21**, 1250090 (2012).
[48] A. Miković, M. Vojinović, A finiteness bound for the EPRL/FK spin foam model, Class. Quantum Grav. **30**, 035001 (2013).
[49] M. Dupuis, E. R. Livine, Lifting SU(2) spin networks to projected spin networks, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 064044 (2010).
[50] E. R. Livine, S. Speziale, New spinfoam vertex for quantum gravity, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 084028 (2007).
[51] S. Pulmannová, Transition amplitude spaces and quantum logics with vector-valued states, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **29**, 455 (1990).
[52] E. G. Beltrametti, M. J. Maczynski, On a characterization of classical and nonclassical probablities, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 1280 (1991).
[53] A. Uhlmann, The transition probability for states of *-algebra, Ann. Physik (Leipzig) **42**, 524 (1985).
[54] J. C. Baez, Spin networks in gauge theory, Adv. Math. **117**, 253 (1996).
[55] B. Coecke, I. Stubbe, Operational resolutions and state transitions in a categorical setting, Found. Phys. Lett. **12**, 29 (1999).
[56] E. Zafiris, On quantum event structures I,II, Found. Phys. Lett. **14**, 147-177 (2001).
[57] A. Döring, C. J. Isham, Classical and quantum probabilities as truth values, J. Math. Phys. **53**, 032101 (2012).

[58] I. Stubbe, Categorical structures enriched in a quantaloid: Categories, distributors and functors, Theory Appl. Categ. **14**, 1 (2005).
[59] D. Aerts, Description of many separated physical entities without the paradoxes encountered in quantum mechanics, Found. Phys. **12**, 1131 (1982).
[60] B. Coecke, Structural characterization of compoundness, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **39**, 585 (2000).
[61] L. Smolin, Y.-d. Wan, Propagation and interaction of chiral states in quantum gravity, Nucl. Phys. B **796**, 331 (2008).
[62] B. Bahr, On knotting in the physical Hilbert space of LQG as given by the EPRL model, Class. Quantum Grav. **28**, 045002 (2011).
[63] J. C. Baez, D. K. Wise, A. S. Crans, Exotic statisitcs for strings in 4d BF theory, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **11**, 707 (2007).
[64] C.-j. Wang, M. Levin, Braiding statistics of loop excitations in three dimension, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 080403 (2014).
[65] S.-h. Jiang, A. Mesaros, Y. Ran, Generalized modular transformations in (3+1)D topologically ordered phases and triple linking invariant of loop braiding, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 031048 (2014).
[66] J. C. Wang, X.-G. Wen, Non-Abelian string and particle braiding in topological order: Modular $\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{Z})$ representation and (3+1)-dimensional twisted gauge theory, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 035134 (2015).
[67] J. Wang, X.-G. Wen, S.-T. Yau, Quantum statistics and spacetime surgery, arXiv:1602.05951v2.
[68] I. Bobtcheva, R. Piergallini, A universal invariant of four-dimensional 2-handlebodies and three-manifolds, arXiv:math/0612806.
[69] C. I. Pérez-Sánchez, Surgery in colored tensor models, arXiv:1608.00246v2.
[70] B. Coecke, R. Lal, Causal categories: Relativistically interacting processes, Found. Phys. **43**, 458 (2013).
[71] S. Gupta, Causality in spin foam models, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 064014 (2000).
[72] G. Immirzi, Causal spin foams, arXiv:1610.04462.
[73] D. Oriti, Feynman propagator for spin foam quantum gravity, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 111301 (2005).
[74] W. Donnelly, Entanglement entropy in loop quantum gravity, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 104006 (2008).
[75] L. Hardy, Operational general relativity: Possibilistic, probabilistic, and quantum, arXiv:1608.06940.
[76] M. J. Hadley, The logic of quantum mechanics derived from classical general relativity, Found. Phys. Lett. **10**, 43 (1997).
[77] F. Markopoulou, L. Smolin, Disordered locality in loop quantum gravity states, Class. Quantum Grav. **24**, 3813 (2007).

WUHAN INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, WUHAN 430071, CHINA, AND UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100049, CHINA

E-mail address: kankuohsiao@whu.edu.cn